LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
Chap. E680
Shelf H19
PRESENTED BY
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

THE

WAR CLAIMS OF THE SOUTH.

THE NEW SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY, WITH THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AS ITS CLAIM AGENCY, DEMANDING INDEMNITY FOR CONQUEST, AND THREATENING A DISPUTED PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

THE CANDIDACY OF HAYES AND THE RELIEF OF THE REPUBLIC FROM DANGER.

AN ADDRESS

At Cooper Institute, New York, Wednesday Evening, October 25, 1876,

AND LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK WORLD REPLYING TO THAT JOURNAL, AND TO GOVERNOR TILDEN,

By M. HALSTEAD,
OF CINCINNATI.

CINCINNATI:
ROBERT CLARKE & CO., PRINTERS.
1876.

LC50
.H9

THE

WAR CLAIMS OF THE SOUTH.

FELLOW-CITIZENS :

The October State elections this year have not decided the Presidential election. That has been referred to New York. I am here to speak of a matter of business connected with the election; and the letter from the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, published this morning, certifies the importance of that business. I propose to speak of the public peril of the war claims of the "Solid South"—of the new Southern Confederacy—with the Democratic party as its claim agency demanding indemnity for conquest, and threatening a disputed Presidential election, which would reduce the American Republic to the grade of Mexico. I propose also to show that the Southern claims are greater in proportions than the National debt, and that the idea at the root of the matter is the adoption of the Confederate system of finance—the issue of legal-tender paper to pay the claims—a policy that would reduce the finances, the credit, the bonds of the Nation to a level with those of the Southern Confederacy—the level of hopeless bankruptcy. I propose to speak, too, of the reorganization of the Confederate army, equipped with pocket-pistols and shot-guns, to disregard the only condition imposed by the Nation when the Confederacy was crushed by military force—that of manhood suffrage—and to carry the Republican States of the South for the Democratic party by the deadly derringer.

Mr. Tilden, as any one can see by the last issue of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper, is a gentleman in the bloom of early manhood, standing in an attitude that recalls the First Napoleon, before the door of the Treasury. I am at a loss to know whether it is Mr. Tilden's apparent youth and innocence, or his probable excess of occupation preventing the study of the subject, that has caused his singularly complete mis-apprehension of the extent and character of the Confederate War Claims, and of his own relations to them. As for the restraints that he assumes to impose upon himself, in the letter in which he testifies to the critical importance of the War Claims urged by the United South, the gentleman has forgotten that no longer ago than in the first week of August he reminded his countrymen, when accepting the nomination of the St. Louis Convention, that "experience had repeatedly exposed the futility of self-imposed restrictions by candidates." It must have been an imperative sense of the necessity of saying something, and that quickly, that overcame what we may assume was the natural reluctance of Governor Tilden, after announcing the futility of self-imposed restraints in such cases, to make proclamation of the restraints that he presumes to impose upon himself.

He tells what he will do if he is elected President respecting the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, which do not apply to the Southern claims that we are talking about. We refer to claims for damages to Southern property—claims that property was taken for the use of the army. And the truth is, if we are living under a Confederate form of Government, if the National soldiers were trespassers upon the soil of the seceded States, the Confederate war claims are just and ought to be paid. The sensibility of Governor Tilden on this subject is worthy of all praise. But we must take his word for it that such a self-imposed restraint has been shown by experience to be futile. There is one restraint in which I have confidence, and only one, and that is to restrain the Governor of New York from becoming President of the United States. The Governor

of Ohio is the better man for the place. He was himself "a trespasser upon Southern soil" when it was made sacred by secession, and if he is elected President we shall not be troubled by Confederate War Claims.

"We, the people of the United States," have accomplished the end of the Constitution, in forming "a more perfect union" than that Confederacy which was the weakness of our fathers in the Revolution. Through prosperous peace and triumphant war we have become a mighty Nation. The Nation is a Republic, based upon manhood suffrage: and I propose to discuss the question whether we can afford to place the General Government in the hands of the political organization whose record promises, and whose attitude threatens, a return to that Confederate system, which is identified with the intolerant rule of a sectional class, and illustrated by those chapters of our history that are of evil fame, and whose "disasters veiled the sun."

All citizens who are interested in fair play for industry in good works should rejoice in the cry that we must have a change—reform, economy, and "wise finance:" but in the capacity of an independent citizen it is impossible to accept the Democratic party as the agency of reformation.

The October elections have referred the Presidential contest to New York: and I, a citizen of the larger and more populous and Republican of the October States, Ohio, am here to address the people of the State of Destiny in this year of lofty recollections and hopes, on what I understand to be in the most serious sense a matter of business.

Indiana was not won by the Republicans in the election on the 10th of this month, because the baleful delusions that grow like rag weeds from issues of legal-tender paper had not been dispelled by courageous and competent instruction of the people in the canvassing of other years: and because importance was given rather to sentimental excitement than to affairs of business growing out of the war.

Ohio was won by the Republicans on the same day, because the State was faithfully canvassed and the people happily educated on the money questions last year, and because the true meaning of the Consolidated Southern Confederacy in presenting its bills for war claims to the National Treasury, was given through the campaign the uncommon conspicuity its startling importance demanded.

West Virginia was carried by the Democratic party upon the theory that the Southern war claims would be tenderly nurtured by that party, and made to bring forth golden, or rather greenback fruit in gracious abundance—and so the South is before the country as a united section in behalf of an unprincipled party; and in the Southern Republican States the old Confederate army, reorganized in derringer clubs, is engaged in a deadly "still hunt" for the possession of power that "means business" in an eminent degree.

When Germany crushed the military Empire of France she demanded an indemnity for her trouble. The conqueror gathered the spoil with the glory. The American Republic trampled down the Southern Confederacy, and the Confederates, revived and restored to citizenship, feel that justice requires in their behalf a reversal of all the precedents of warfare, and are confidently requiring as a peace-offering from those who overcame them, compensation for losses suffered,—the infliction upon the conqueror of a fine for the damages that impoverished the vanquished. This may be described as a novelty, and it adds a fresh point to Wellington's famous remark, that next to defeat the greatest misfortune is victory.

The Confederates are quite right about it, however, if they are sound in their theory of the form of our Government; and if the Democratic party has any principle, we understand it to be that the Southern Confederacy was right and the National Government wrong in the beginning, the course, and the end of the war. If the National soldier was a "trespasser" wherever he touched the sacred soil of a Sovereign Southern State that, in the exercise of

her highest capacity, had withdrawn from the Union—and I understand there is distinguished Democratic authority for this proposition in the State of New York—we can not, of course, get out of the responsibility of paying for all the mischief done—without sneaking out of it, and we must not do that.

The cloud of the Southern claims is not spectral—it is not a ghost that will vanish when you speak to it; but it is the overshadowing reality of the political campaign about to close. If we put the Consolidated Southern Confederacy in possession of the National Government, we must expect the Southern claims to be allowed, and that they will be pressed to payment as a debt of honor.

This is not a phantom danger. It is a plain business fact. It is the fruit of the logic, if it has not the flavor of the literature, of the Democratic party.

Now that organization has no fixed principles, if we except the general one that the late war was the result of the rebellion of the North against the Divine authority of the South—and in the absence of this special illumination of our history, the South has no grievance for which the National Government is responsible. Why then the appearance of the Solid South in the St. Louis Convention? Why the total indifference in that Convention of the mass of Southern delegates to the terms of the platform and the names of the candidates, save only as they might promise success, and power, signifying in its last analysis money?

The Virginian theory of the Constitution once interfered with appropriations by Congress for local enterprises, but a change has passed over the spirit of the Southern dream; and we do not hear of the constitutional lawyers of Virginia objecting to the appropriation of the uncounted millions wanted for the James River Canal, the climax of which is a tunnel through the Allegheny Mountains seven miles in length, where there would be the total lack of water that in the old story spoiled the mill-seat. We do not hear that the Southwestern experts in the ancient mysteries of the Constitution find any difficulty in taxing the

people of the unprotected overflowed lands of the Wabash and White Rivers of Indiana, and the Scioto and Miami Rivers of Ohio, to build Mississippi levees; or that they require any stronger argument for constructing a Southern Pacific Railroad than that a vast sum was wasted on the Northern Pacific line.

The Solid South seeks money through jobs and claims that we must pronounce preposterous, not only with eager energy, but with perfect sincerity in the opinion that the money belongs in all fairness and righteousness to the Southern people.

The South has suffered deeply—was desolated and impoverished by the war. The distress of her people has been great, and in defeat and poverty they were entitled to our best sympathy and kindness and help. It is sorrowful that there has been a lack of healing statesmanship. We are all heavy losers through that misfortune. There was, though, when the military part of the war was over, a Statesman in the White House, and he was assassinated. Then a Southern man became President, and our first trouble with him was to reduce the plethora of his passion for hanging the traitors he knew—perhaps too well, if not wisely.

We followed the precedent of elevating to our highest civil office the most successful of our Generals, and he at least has ever since been regretful that he accepted the nomination. Now, I am not of those who have been constrained by a sense of partisan duty to incessantly applaud the Administration. I wanted a change long ago, but I have been in thorough sympathy and agreement with the President in one particular. He has been in favor of the United States of America; and when charged with unkindness of spirit toward the Southern people, we may well remember that it certainly did not appear in the terms he gave Lee at Appomattox, or in his report, at the close of the war, on the operations of the armies under his command, in which he paid a glowing compliment to Southern soldiery; and it is pertinent to inquire what encouragement

the President and the generous sentiments of the North had, in the treatment that the Southern people gave their General Longstreet when he was appointed to an office of honor and profit?

I do not propose to sing the songs of praise of the Administration, or to cease from criticism; but it is only fair to say that if the South has been infested by and suffered from the Carpet-bagger and Scalawag, the fault is not wholly or chiefly that of the Administration, or of the people of the States that conquered a peace and saved the Union. And while I claim to be as independent as a journalist can be who is in favor of one side when there are but two sides, I am not in any case in favor of putting the Southern Confederacy on top of the United States.

I am completely willing that the people of the South should manage their own affairs, in their own way, "subject only to the Constitution of the United States;" but I wish it understood, when I say "people of the South," that I mean all the people, and recognize no natural right of any race to rule. I would that the people of the South had given more attention to their own affairs. But when the old Confederate politicians prepare, with a crusade of hate and reign of terror, the united South, and propose to "occupy and possess" all the departments of National authority, and to exact from the people at large indemnity for the conquest of the Confederacy, it is something far more menacing to all of us than when the same politicians twenty years ago attempted, not for the sake of slavery, but in the love of the political power associated with slavery, to nationalize the peculiar institution;—and this grim portent of a sectional caste, taking the form of the Solid South, and the name of the Democratic party, should be confronted and overwhelmed by the Solid North—not in hate and fury, not under banners of blood, but soberly, discreetly, in self-defense, and in the interests of the public peace and the general welfare; and so clear is the issue, that it is a shame there is a doubt about the vote of a single county from Maine to Oregon.

In the very dawn of the promise of brighter times of business, in the white light of the statesmanlike utterances of the Republican candidate for the Presidency in his letter of acceptance of the Cincinnati nomination, arises the darkness of the Solid South; and unwholesome sectional dissensions have characterized the campaign of this year that we had hoped would be memorable only for happiness—and for the cordial universal celebration of the reality of the Proclamation—of the revered inscription of Independence Bell: Of liberty, throughout the land and unto all the inhabitants thereof.

We are told with ostentation that the whole South has accepted the situation, and is reconstructed forever more. The politicians who dragged the people of that section into the Confederacy, terrorizing the whites—who opposed them at that time as they do the blacks in this—are convinced that they made a mistake in running away from the National Capital when they held majorities in both houses of Congress. They have ascertained that they took the wrong road to reach the supremacy that they believed was their birthright. They propose, therefore, leaving vain regrets for errors past, to remain in the Union, and use the Democratic party, their steadfast servant in other days, for their fixed purposes. They will not again flee from the fort, throwing away in imbecile fury the weapons they hold, that they may return in the pride of their nakedness to storm its gates.

Their desires are as strenuous and their aims as far-reaching as ever, but they have acquired a better appreciation of means to their ends. They prefer the inside of things to the outside, and on all questions involving bread and butter, there is an enlargement of understanding and an aptitude in adjustment.

We are asked what is the motive of these men, and wherein is danger to be expected? The abolition of slavery is complete and irreversible! What shall take its place as a basis of operations for political enterprises of great pith and moment? The answer is, Southern Claims take the

place of slavery as a huge and dominating sectional interest. They mean more money than there was in all the negroes in America. It is the flagrant intention that those claims shall ultimately include the slaves emancipated by the sword, and that there shall be added to them the value, according to the estimates of the owners, of the cotton destroyed, and the corn, green and dry, in the fields and the cribs, that was consumed by men and beasts in the National service. Then we see coming, like a cloud of grasshoppers, myriads of thousand-dollar mules and pianos, and an endless array of velvet parlor furniture and rosewood fence-rails.

The National debt has a conservative influence. Horace Greeley said there was no danger that the debt would ever be repudiated; it was "too big to be repudiated." Why, these Southern claims are bigger than the National debt. They are the cement of the Solid South. They include the losses of the South from the begining—interest calculated on all the items. There isn't a Congressman, from the Potomac, along the Ohio and the Missouri to the Kansas line, and down to the Gulf and the Rio Grande, who would dare, as a candidate for re-election, to oppose these claims. They are the sacred thing of the Solid South.

Still, slavery is abolished! It is abolished, no doubt, so far as the so-called patriarchal relation goes. Individuals will no longer own men, women, and children. The auction block for property in man is overthrown, but it is proposed to make the persons who have been emancipated from the control of masters, Slaves of the States. With this view, the blacks have already been disfranchised by the process of the pocket-pistol in all States in which they are in the majority, with the possible exception of South Carolina; and the glitter of the bayonet in that State as opposed to the derringer, is the token for tremblings and pertubations touching the Constitution. These were not felt when United States Marshals called for troops to catch fugitive slaves, but we became accustomed to them in the days when the last Democratic President could find no warrant in law

to resist the seizure of National property by States. The cannon of South Carolina thundered upon the Star of the West when carrying provisions to Fort Sumter, and the steamer put out to sea, leaving our soldiers to starve, but the Democratic President could not discover in the Constitution that it would do to shoot back. There occurred a change in the administration, and while the Confederate cannon were volleying on the fort, the people gave the Constitution an interpretation that should abide with it forever.

When the war was over, there was no hanging, no confiscation of the estates of the architects of rebellion. Notwithstanding the assassination of Lincoln, the spirit of the North was kindly. There was tenderness of heart in the victors toward the vanquished. After some delays that were unfortunate, there was reconstruction, substantially upon the basis of general amnesty and impartial suffrage. The one condition exacted before the restoration of the Confederates to the political rights they had thrown away was, that the emancipated slaves should be enfranchised.

Now, the behaviour of the freedmen, while there were armies deciding, in the high debates of battlefields, what their future was to be, should have earned the gratitude and the affection of the Southern whites. Scenes of servile insurrection were not added to the horrors of civil war.

The black citizens have not been faultless. They have looked too much to the Government and too little to themselves; but their education was more expensive than instructive. Still, they know some essential things wonderfully well. Once a poor old field hand in Kentucky put the case in a few words. It was during the agitation of the "amendment" that was supposed to secure his race the right of suffrage. He was asked in a tone of fierce derision what he intended to do with himself when he became a voter, and he answered, with religious solemnity: "Well, marster, if I gets to vote, I will vote as near as I know for them that stood for me." That is what is the matter with the black voters. They are the faithful friends of the American Nation, and so far as they know (and they have a pretty keen instinct where

they have not knowledge), they are against the restoration, to the position of a ruling class, of the Confederate politicians by whom they, and their masters too, were held in servitude.

When the Confederate Generals surrendered, the grand army of the United States was disbanded. The everlasting reconstruction of the white people of the South was accepted as accomplished. The negro armed with the ballot —the poor man's proper weapon to defend his humble but precious and sacred interests—was to take care of himself.

The practical proposition of the Solid South, and the leading idea of the Democratic party, is to-day that the old Confederate army may be reorganized in a private way, with concealed weapons—or with displayed arms if their arrogance is so excited that they scorn mere pocket-pistol warfare—and that this armed force may disfranchise the blacks at pleasure, choose Electors, and elect Congressmen and Legislatures, and take away from the General Government the only guarantee that in the magnanimous mood of unqualified conquest was exacted.

If Confederate desperadoes may thus possess Congress and the Presidency too, and the National authorities have no rights that men armed with derringers are bound to respect, we ought not to be surprised or make any protest whatever, if called upon to pay the bills of the once dear departed but now reinstated Confederacy, even if they amount to more than the French indemnity. And we may conclude, with the rehabilitation of the Confederacy, and its extension to our remotest frontiers, slavery, abolished as a personal matter, is re-established as a State institution; that a system of State servitude, to be called apprenticeship, or some other and softer name, will speedily be enacted and enforced in the interests of Southern peace; for if the reign of terror is to be perpetuated and its scope is to be National, it will be necessary to regulate it by law, that inducements to assassination may not be so imperative as to cause the massacre of a race.

If we must accept this as the prerequisite of peace in the land of the derringer, our gain in the overthrow of the

Southern Confederacy by force of arms would be the privilege of paying the damages inflicted upon the Confederates, in addition to bearing our own burdens; while the loss of the politicians of the South would be that of the obligation to pay their own bills: and they would gain an enlargement of the Confederate domain to the remotest National limits—a territory wider, with prerogatives richer than they ever dared to dream of winning by successful war. "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than War.

The rivers of West Virginia unite her with Ohio, and the mountains divide her from Old Virginia, but in the late election neither the rivers nor the mountains could retain her, and she gave herself utterly to the ancient regime. She had no reason to complain of the Republican party within her borders. While the Republicans were in power her affairs were well managed. When the war was over and gentle peace had fully returned, the Confederates were all enfranchised and the people had a "change." Everything was lovely and of good report, but, as usual, the Democratic party had to come into power. It was "the gaunt wolf waiting at the door" of the State. But there is no reform to speak of in connection with the "change." On the contrary, West Virginia has been as badly governed ever since as she could well have been if the Carpet-baggers were in authority and the Scalawags had given their whole attention to public business. Just now, if the people there wanted a change and reform and economy, they would have to try the Republican party; and, other things being equal, they would do it gladly, for there is nothing that so cures a State of longing for Democratic reformation as a brief trial of it.

It was not love of the Southern Confederacy, or of the Democratic party, *per se*, that fixed the place of West Virginia in the Tilden column. It was the overbearing influence of the Southern War Claims that controlled the State. Here is an extract of a letter from Grafton, West Virginia, stating the facts,—and I beg that you will give

it your most considerate attention, for it is from a citizen of intelligence and responsibility. He says:

"In the payment of such claims (Southern War Claims), West Virginia is more largely interested, in proportion to population, than any other State; and it is because it was believed these claims would be paid by the United States if Tilden is elected, that the State voted so largely Democratic the other day. This is the secret of the result; this is the bottom fact of the situation in this State.

"In all the strong Democratic counties there are men of influence who have claims. They have worked for Democratic success as statesmen with Texas bonds in their pockets, worked for annexation and for the $10,000,000 bill. 'There's millions in it.' Right here in this town I know of men who have these claims for property destroyed or captured, who worked most earnestly and voted for the Democratic ticket on the avowed ground that a Democratic success in the United States would assure the payment of their claims. But for their influence, the Republican gain here would have been even greater than it was. One of these 'claims' is for between seven and eight thousand dollars, for property destroyed and taken by the Union army; another is for similar damages and for fifteen slaves set free. And so on, all around, from hen-roosts to immortal intellects. Every one of the owners of these 'claims' is an ex-rebel sympathizer, at best.

"You can judge, hence, how it is in the strong rebel counties, where hatred of the Union is not disguised, and where pretty much everybody is thirsting for revenge. There the enthusiasm in behalf of 'Southern claims,' in behalf of making the Yankee pay all the losses of the South after all, is simply irrepressible. It is not attempted to be concealed, as it is here. And it is this which swept all the frontier counties like a tornado—only this and nothing more."

The writer of this letter inclosed with it a note of identification, and used this language:

"There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that I here state the true reason for the great Democratic victory in

this State. The immense danger thus threatened by the Southern claims is not at all appreciated by the North. If it were, there would be no possibility of Tilden getting a single Northern State."

During the recent canvass in Ohio, when the Democrats noticed the question of the Southern war claims, they, as a rule, asserted that there was a constitutional amendment that prohibited the payment of those claims. You are aware that the fourth clause of the Fourteenth Amendment is the only one that has any relation to the subject, and that it refers to the payment of debt "incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States," and to "compensation for slaves," and is not applicable at all to claims for damages.

War claims are among the worst results of war, for they can not be cured like wounds inflicted in the shock of battle. They are cancerous, and of ceaseless malignancy in growth. We must be at pains to see of what items those we are discussing consist, and how they develop like tumors. Here is—

"*Claim No.* 3,107. (*Before the Claims Commissioners and disallowed.*) *January* 18, 1875. *Referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed. Marie P. Evans, of Orleans Parish, Louisiana. Total amount claimed in original petition*, $272,590; *in amended petition*, $495,355."

Here are specifications, as follows:

No. 1	825 hhds. centrifugal sugar, of average weight of 1,300 lbs. net per hhd., being 1,072,500 lbs., at 25c. per lb	$268,125
No. 2.	400 bbls. golden sirup (molasses), at 40 galls. per bbl., making 16,000 galls., at $1.50 per gall	24,000
	500 bbls. sugar-house molasses, at 40 galls. per bbl., making 20,000 galls., at $1	20,000
No. 3.	1,000 empty bbls., at $2	2,000
No. 4	3,000 cords of dry wood, at $5	15,000
No. 5.	62 mules, at $200	12,400
No. 6.	15 wagons, at $150	2,250
No. 7	3 carts, at $75	225
No. 8.	3 drays, at $75	225
No. 9.	3 gas tanks (iron), at $100	300
No. 10.	26,600 bush. corn (in car), at $1	26,600

No. 11. 374 tons fodder (corn blades) and hay, at $25	9,350
No. 12. 5 horses, at $200	1,000
No. 13. 5 bbls. brandy, at $400	2,000

The number of the items is thirty-two; of these, No. 31 is for 145,000 fence rails, made of the most beautiful and expensive timber in the world, no doubt. The only thing that should surprise us in the bill of particulars is that the sixty-two mules were not put at $1,000 each! The moderation of the claimant has not, however, been appreciated; for the claim is in the list of the disallowed. The first time it was presented the sum total was but $272,590. The amended petition is for $495,355. The effect of not paying in the first place is seen in the growth of 500 hogsheads of sugar in the first claim to 1,109 hogsheads in the second, while the price of the sugar expanded from $200 per hogshead to $325 per hogshead. The 800 cords of wood alleged, in the bill of particulars of 1871, to have been taken, grew to 3,000 cords in 1873. Forty mules, at $150 each, had multiplied to sixty-two mules, at $200 each. 5,000 bushels of corn were developed into 26,600 bushels; 500 pounds of bulk pork, in 1871, grew to 5,000 pounds in 1873; and if Tilden is elected, there is no reason to doubt that each item will be multiplied by ten, so that we shall have to pay for 50,000 pounds of bulk pork, and so on through the list.

Take another example:

"No. 14,103. Charles G. Kerr, Fitzhugh Lee, and George W. C. Lee, executors of Anna M. Fitzhugh, late of Alexandria County, Virginia, deceased.

"Claim filed May 20, 1872. Value of 125,000 cords oak and pine timber, cut and taken from the estate of Ravensworth, Fairfax County, by orders of various Quartermasters, in 1861, '62, '63, '64, and '65, at $3 per cord, $375,000."

The entire Ravensworth property, 7,826 acres, was assessed at $78,260 before the war and since, and the Commissioners report the assessed value to be about two-thirds of the actual value; but here are $375,000 worth of wood cut off a tract of land worth at most $100,000, and the

value of the land not in the least impaired. The miracle of the loaves and fishes can not be said to rank with this achievement.

Take the claim of Mrs. Annie Whitmore, of Whitfield county, Georgia, a bill for whose relief was kindly presented by the Hon. Benoni S. Fuller, of Indiana. The amount of this claim is $840,494. Here are specimen points:

1 horse, which was by good judges estimated	$2,300
35 horses, $150	5,100
12 young mules, $175	2,100
4,250 bushels corn, $1.50	6,375
50 tons fodder, $15	750
10 tons hay, $20	200
300 acres corn fodder	240
20 head beef cattle, $50	1,000
262 bales of cotton, 500 lbs. per bale, taken for hospital purposes, $1	131,000
1,338 bales of cotton, 500 lbs. per bale, $1	669,000
4 parlor sets—1 garnet velvet, 1 satin, 1 silk, 1 stripe, $300	1,200
1 parlor set, black mohair	200
1 parlor set, green silk velvet	400
1 parlor set, plaid, stripe, blue, red, and green empress	350
1 piano, Chickering	600
1 piano, Steinway grand	800

The spirit of "conciliation, economy, and reform" displayed in putting down only seven parlor sets of furniture—one a garnet velvet and another a green silk velvet—and of estimating an invaluable horse at $2,300 only—should be highly esteemed. Mr. Fuller was re-elected to Congress substantially on the merits of this little claim, in a strong Democratic district in Southern Indiana, and his public career promises to be a brilliant success.

Among the bills presented to the present House of Representatives by Mr. Bright, of Tennessee, we will look at two clipped from a list of some hundreds of the same general character.

"A bill to pay the Presbyterian church of Mufreesboro, Tennessee, $10,000, said church having been used as a hospital for sick and wounded Union soldiers.

"A bill to pay Thomas Hoard $58,995 for supplies taken

and used by the army of the United States from the farm of said Hoard (the battle-ground of Stone River), near Mufreesboro, Tennessee."

It is stated, by soldiers familiar with the place, that the Presbyterian church at Mufreesboro was not worth more than $5,000 when new, and that it was first occupied and damaged by the Confederates, who used it as a hospital until driven from the town. The bill for damages done on the battle-ground of Stone River implies that the national troops were the only ones who disturbed the valuable property in that quarter, but the history of the battle does not quite corroborate this flattering presumption.

However, if the National soldiers were trespassers throughout the war, the bill is accounted for, and ought to be paid. The next thing, perhaps, will be a bill from the old proprietors of the ground in and about the Andersonville prison-pens, for the trees destroyed by the prisoners in their efforts to shelter themselves from the sun and the rains. If we guide our feet by the lamps of the Democracy and along their peculiar paths of peace, what objection can be made to that bill?

Persons affirm, however, that such bills are absurd and incredible, and that payment is impossible; and those who have attempted to impress upon the public the seriousness of the Southern prosecution of war claims have been hooted as phantom-fighters.

Let us see if there is not every possible proof that could be given in advance of the accession of the Democratic party to power, of the certainty that these very claims will be sharply pressed by a formidable force. Missouri leads the way in State action. She created a War Claims Commission in 1873; and Governor Woodson, in his annual message to the General Assembly, January 6, 1875, says:

"There were presented to the Board of Commissioners eleven thousand nine hundred and sixty-one (11,961) claims, amounting in the aggregate to $4,844,362.29. Seven thousand five hundred and fifty-four (7,554) of those claims were allowed during the time in which the Board had the right to sit, and certificates have been issued therefor, ag-

gregating the sum of $2,382,132.67. At the expiration of the time fixed by law for the adjustment of the claims pending before them, there were a great many claims unacted upon, it proving a physical impossibility for the Commissioners to examine and pass upon all the claims filed within the time prescribed by the act."

This is the first crop, so great that the handling of it was a physical impossibility. As for moral possibilities, any sovereign State can swing millions of them. If the Solid South succeeds in its enterprise, employing the Democratic party to capture the Government, there will be a succession of crops, each larger than all the preceding. In the State of Georgia the preparation of claims is such a business that blank forms to facilitate the work are circulated all over the State, and are an indispensable article of stationery. A citizen of Hamilton county, Ohio, an old Democrat, recently returned to his home from Alabama, where he has interests, and related that when he told the Alabamians that he would go for Tilden, they talked to him in such a style that he thought it his duty as a good citizen to vote the Republican ticket. They denounced the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution as "bayonet amendments." They all said that the Yankee armies had marched across their farms, and had a stereotyped way of closing, "I have my bill made out, sir, and if there is any justice in this country I 'll get every dollar of it." There is no numbering these bills, and the appointed time for pressing them to payment is when the Democratic party takes possession of the Government.

All the war claims that we have heard of are but the first drops of the shower, and the Southern sky is full of rain. After the election of Tilden, if that is to be, comes the Deluge.

So impatient were the claimants that they could not wait for a propitious time to reduce their hopes to legal writing. They have for years been making careful surveys, with a view to sapping and mining their way into the National Treasury; and recently they have been vigorously at work upon a concerted plan of siege, prepared, it is evident, by

skilled engineers, who have looked over the whole ground and marked out the approaches.

Mr. Ritchie, of Maryland, April 13, 1872, made a speech, in which he arraigned the act of July 4, 1864, "which provides for the payment of Southern claims on proof that the property was actually taken and used by the United States army, and that the claimant was loyal to the United States." The grounds of his sensitive antagonism to the act were thus defined:

"First—Because the proof required is too strict.

"Second—Because it does not provide payment for property damaged and destroyed.

"Third—Because said act requires proof of loyalty,"—

On which he says:

"In the bill I have submitted, proof is required only of the justice and validity of the claim. This may be regarded as a material omission by the majority of the House, and if its disposition is such that no additional facilities will be accorded to claimants unless the qualification referred to is added,I would suggest that the bill is within the power of this House for such amendment as it may insist upon. I can only say for myself that in the light of my sworn obligation to support the Constitution, as I understand that fundamental charter alike of our power and the rights of the citizen, I could not recognize in any legislation of my offering a discrimination so false in principle, so pernicious in example, and so unjust in operation."

It will be noted that this gentleman had constitutional scruples on the point of requiring proof of loyalty! Come down to a later day and a programme more comprehensive. On the 30th of June, 1876, Mr. Cabell, of Virginia, reported from the House Committee on War Claims the bill [H. R., 3,827,] for the relief of Pickrell and Broocks, of Virginia. This bill was recommended by the War Claims Committee, and appropriates the sum of $3,524.75 to pay these claimants, the net proceeds of tobacco taken from them at Wilmington, North Carolina, March 21, 1865. The claim is not of great proportions, but the distinguished gentleman from Virginia improved the occasion by laying

down general principles of astounding magnitude. He says that as one of the claimants had received a special pardon from President Johnson, and the other having "come within the provisions of the several proclamations and general pardon of amnesties, the proof of such pardon is equivalent to affirmative proof under the statute of captured and abandoned property, that the party never gave aid and comfort to the rebellion."

When we consider the source and the official promulgation of this sweeping report, we are bound to regard it as good Democratic doctrine. It is recent—it is fresh, and it is strong. It is, that when Andrew Johnson forgave a rebel his sins, thenceforth the rebel was truly loyal, and always had been so in the eye of the law! This is certainly the most marvelous regeneration of which there is any account in the books, sacred or profane.

Mr. Cabell's report from the Committee on War Claims, goes on to announce that in reference to property taken from Southern owners by the Union armies, "the United States Government stands in the position of a trustee for the owner."

I need not pause to speak of the scope of this proposition. It rolls over the whole case as the waters cover the great deep, and all the leviathans of the Confederacy can sport therein.

We will next examine—

"House Resolution No. 553, by Hon. W. W. Wilshire, Arkansas—'To facilitate the adjustment and settlement of claims of citizens of the United States, for stores and supplies taken or furnished during the rebellion, for the use of the Army of the United States,' including the use and loss of vessels and boats, by authorizing suits to be instituted in the United States Court in the district wherein the property was taken or used, such suits to be tried 'by said Courts *in the same manner* and by the same rules of evidence as that now prescribed by law for the trial of civil causes in the Circuit Courts of the United States.'"

This would refer each batch of claims to the citizens of the neighborhood that was despoiled, a scheme that would

fully meet the requirements of Mr. Cabell, of Virginia, that would avoid lacerating the susceptibilities of Mr. Ritchie, of Maryland, and that would prevent any severity of strain upon a Confederate General who might be Mr. Tilden's Secretary of War.

Mr. Wilshire would abolish the Southern Claims Commission, and all tests of loyalty, and pay the damages assessed by juries out of a general appropriation. Of course, he has entire confidence in the spirit of reform and economy and wise finance, that has always animated the juries of Arkansas.

There are so many resolutions having this general direction and bearing, introduced into the House at its late session, that I can not attempt reference to them all; but as we must notice the scheme of the Hon. Haywood Y. Riddle, of Tennessee, to make money plenty and times good in the South, without further labor by the inhabitants, the following is quoted:

"House Resolution No. 871, by Hon. H. Y. Riddle, of Tennessee—Provides that the testimony of 'any reputable citizen' shall be admitted by the Court of Claims and War Department as effectually establishing the fact of appropriation of property for the use of the armies of the United States."

This not only discards the idea that loyalty has anything to do with war claims, but makes one oath by a rebel sufficient to establish effectually a claim.

But Mr. Riddle's brightest achievement, looking to the prosperity of his section, without toil or spinning, is in the introduction, February 28, 1876, of a bill to open the treasury of the United States to make money plenty in the South—a bill referred to the Judiciary Committee, not, of course, to be reported until it can be favorably moved on. It is—

"H. R. 2364. A bill directing compensation for the use and occupation of property by the United States army during the late war:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assem-

bled, that the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized to allow reasonable compensation to all citizens of the United States for the use and occupation of their property by the United States army, or any part thereof, during the late civil war, in the same manner and under the same regulations as compensation is now allowed for Quartermaster stores used by said army; provided, however, that the affidavit of the claimant, supported by the competent testimony of any reputable citizen, shall be sufficient proof to establish the fact of the use and occupation of such property by said army. But it is not the intention of this act to limit the parties to the amount of proof herein specified; but other and additional testimony may be taken to establish the fact of the use and occupation, and the rental value of the property occupied."

Mr. Riddle is running for re-election to Congress, and this bill is the principal plank in his platform. It is a popular plank. He addressed the people of Jamestown, Tennessee, September 28, and claimed that all losses caused by Federal troops or by the Federal Government should be paid alike; that "all Southern people are now loyal," and that no distinction should be made in the settlement of claims against the Government, but everybody should be paid; and pledged himself to work to that effect. His meetings have recently been attended by a phonographic reporter, but he declines to speak when there is such an intrusion. He need not talk any more to his constituents, however. They fully understand him. His district is the Fourth Tennessee, and his popularity—growing out of his celebrity as the advocate of war claims, on the ground that all citizens are equally loyal and always have been, and that there can be no just distinctions in the law—is so great that he has no opposition. The Hon. R. H. Cox, who attempted to compete with him, has retired from the canvass.

The report that we quote of Mr. Riddle's Jamestown speech is from a business letter, and that gentleman's great popularity was accounted for in the remark that the payment of war claims, according to his policy, would "make money plenty and times good in the South." The people

of New York may be interested to mark this and inquire, at whose expense the benefactions are to flow from the pecuniary horn-of-plenty, and who is to have the "usufruct" of the horn?

Mr. Ritchie, of Maryland, complained, twelve years ago, that the proof required on Southern claims was too strict, and that damaged property could not be included, while the crowning trouble was an unconstitutional requirement that loyalty should be shown.

Mr. Cabell, of Virginia, from the Committee of War Claims of the present House, reports that the pardon of a rebel is affirmative proof that he was always loyal, and declares that the United States Government is in the position of a trustee of the Confederate claimants for property taken in the war.

Mr. Wilshire, of Arkansas, would facilitate the settlement of claims by trials by jury, so that the tracks of our armies should be followed by juries of the respective neighborhoods through which they passed, agreeing upon damages to be distributed among themselves.

Mr. Riddle, of Tennessee, would take testimony in claims cases without giving consideration to the question of loyalty, and he would allow compensation to all citizens of the United States for the use and occupation of their property by the United States army, upon the proposition that all discriminations in the law against disloyalists are unjust and offensive.

Taking together Mr. Ritchie, of Maryland, Mr. Cabell, of Virginia, Mr. Wilshire, of Arkansas, and Mr. Riddle, of Tennessee, it is but just to those gentlemen to say that they seem to have left little in the nature of preliminaries to look after—and there never has been a whisper that they did not have the warm approbation of the folks at home.

The record of Mr. Riddle in Congress seems to his constituents a very handsome one. He is credited with a good phrase asserting universal loyalty, and equal rights for all in war claims. There is no better Democratic doctrine than his, for the practical application of it is that wherever

the National armies marched there is a Confederate harvest to be gathered.

And it would be well if these cool and learned gentlemen, who affect to sneer away this aspect of the claims question, would kindly condescend to tell the people of New York what argument or attribute the Democratic party has, that would resist the war-claims policy of the Solid South, as it is defined in the legislation that Mr. Riddle has proposed.

If we begin by admitting that the Union was a Confederacy—that the election of Lincoln was an offense—the Southern campaigns John Brown raids on a large scale, and the abolition of slavery and the enfranchisement of the freedmen, capital outrages—we must end by placing the South on an equality with the North in money matters; that is, we must pay the Southern war debts and claims of every name and nature. Or, from our standpoint, we must pay for the war over again, and something more, for the South was the greater sufferer; and if we would conciliate on the basis of having done a wrong, we must not complain if we have to pay an indemnity equal to the damage we have done.

The Southern people say they desired to go apart, and were compelled to remain. They say to us: "You marched through our country destroying our property, and we were unable to retaliate. You doubled your money in bonds, while we lost all that we put into our bonds; and you gave the blacks the right to confiscate through taxation the little we had when the war was over. You forced us into the Union, and we propose to stay. Now, we are as loyal as you are—as good as you are. We are poor. Above all things we need money. Here are the bills for the ruin that you wrought! If we are equals under the law, the payment of these claims is but fair—and then why should not our crippled boys have pensions as well as yours?"

They need the money badly enough. They believe they ought to have it. Is it public policy to pay it? Only a fraction of it could come from the South itself. Do you, here in New York, think it will be in the interest of Re-

form, and especially Economy, to pay your share of it? Are you unwilling to be taxed to this end? Would you prefer to go with the Greenbackers and issue legal tenders to meet all Southern demands, make money plenty, and give us another experience of war times in Wall street? If not, you should take care not to go with the Solid South —the new shape of the Southern Confederacy—in this critical campaign. The Southern excitement touching war claims is not as yet very noisy, but it is intense and profound. It has been restrained by every prudential consideration that could influence men convinced that they have been wronged and resolved to be righted, and yet it is submitted there is ample testimony before the country to determine the action of prudent citizens. It were easy to specify circumstances in corroboration of the proof until you would weary with the recital. A Southern Republican, writing from the State of Mississippi, October 3, 1876, to Hon. Warner M. Bateman, District Attorney of the Southern District of Ohio, says:

"If we should attempt to organize our party in this State, and advocate the support of Hayes and Wheeler, it would cause riot and bloodshed all over the State, for the White Line Rebels are determined to carry the State, though we have a clear majority of thirty thousand at a fair election. Any excuse to deprive Republicans of their rights as American citizens is a source of great consolation to the White Liners."

The writer adds, it is the purpose of the controlling spirits of that State to "remunerate themselves out of the public treasury for losses sustained by the war." If these things occur in the green tree, what may not be expected in the dry wood?

Can any people having saving common sense afford to disregard these claims, the certainty and immensity of which are attested by proposed legislation, manifestly prepared to remove all the safeguards of the Treasury, while they are notoriously backed by the passionate and exacting public opinion of the section whence they spring? So unequivocal are the claims, and so prodigious are they (the ag-

gregate represented in the various bills of special and general legislation exceeding two thousand five hundred millions of dollars)—so distinct are the principles upon which they are based, and so consonant are those principles with the character of the party that must take the responsibility of them.—while the line of argument by which they are justified is staked out quite to the horizon—that fair notice has been served upon the country that they are to be prosecuted with the entire strength of the United South. And it is distinctly indicated that the price of the Southern support of the Democratic party is the service of the party as the claim agency for that section.

The ready assertion of the average Democratic local politician of the North is that the party would, if placed in control of the Government, be responsible to the country for the success of the Administration, and could not consent to consider the war claims in the shape and to the extent that we suggest. It is thus assumed, in the first place, that the Democratic party is, where the Solid South is concerned, a free agent. I do not believe it is so. The South has the force of a clear purpose, an inflexible will, an unappeasable animosity, and the habit of command, as well as a hungry sense of a right to have a square meal at home; and it will have, as it has had, its way with the party.

It is said the Democratic party would quickly destroy itself by taking up the Southern claims, and must, in cold-blooded reason, be credited with too strong an instinct of self-preservation to swiftly rush to certain slaughter. But this identical party, backed by a majority merely in the South, withstood for years the odium of the Fugitive Slave Law, and the ruling caste in it at last felt strong enough to repeal the Missouri Compromise and attempt the nationalization of slavery. Give these partisans the whole South with its enlarged representation—every Congressional District—and place in their hands the army for reorganization, with the chance of restoring the Confederate leaders to their old regiments; let them rebuild the navy and use the vast civil patronage of the government, extravagantly extended as it has been in the last sixteen years—add to

this the "solid vote" that the Catholic Telegraph of Cincinnati promised the party; let one wing of the Democratic army rest upon Richmond and the other upon Rome; and reckon upon the arts of Demagoguery that would harness in one team the fanatics of the Ultramontane and the Communist schools—and we are not sure that the Democracy—always the regulars in our politics and never subjected to discipline more rigorously than now—could defy the power of enlightened public opinion for a tedious term of years. It is quite certain that if this powerful party is placed in possession of the General Government by the casting vote of the State of New York one week from Tuesday next—and that is precisely the contingency that the people of this State should have in mind—no matter how profligate and reckless the Administration might be, it could not be overthrown without a long and stormy, and perhaps a dangerous struggle.

Give the Democratic party the power that with the help of New York it may grasp, and there would prevail through the whole range of official life, and in the ranks of the long array of those who get their living out of politics, an intolerant assertion of Party Infallibility. The despotism would be of iron grip, and any attempt to disturb it would be denounced as resembling old-fashioned Abolitionism in its sectional aspect, as threatening another incendiary raid upon the Holy Confederacy of the Solid South, and as a reckless assault upon the sacred peace of the sunny land that reposes under the undisputed sway of pocket firearms.

I trust we shall not now, or ever, try the costly experiment of committing the country to this course. But there are good citizens who desire to take this crisis quietly, who are making themselves content with saying that the shrewd men at the head of the Democratic party are too cautious to impose the taxes that would be required to raise the money to pay the Southern war claims. It has not perhaps occurred to them—though many of them, no doubt, take a deep interest in the speedy resumption of specie payments—that the claimants might be content with "more green-

backs." They have not seen that the Rag-baby and the Solid South with her solemn claims were made for each other. They have not studied the history of the Ohio campaign in 1875, which the inflationists—meaning mischief mountain high—started with the expectation of sweeping the country, putting forth as their platform the Confederate system of finance—the very system that made money so abundant in the South, while the Southern armies were still strong, that a pair of boots cost a thousand dollars. The inevitable way to pay the Confederate war claims is with legal-tender paper. Those claims fortuitously offer the solution of the difficulty of the rag-money maniacs in distributing new issues. Bales of thousand-dollar notes will be wanted to pay the toll of our armies on the turnpikes in the sacred soil, and to compensate those who were conquered for all their losses and sorrows; and as the cost of producing a thousand-dollar note is not greater than that of a one-dollar note, we shall have big money printed, and with it celebrate our "wise finance" to the ends of the earth. We shall put the stamp of the United States upon all the paper that the emergency, which can always be found, calls for. In the language of the platform of the immortal Inflationists in Ohio, we shall "make the volume of currency equal to the wants of trade." This will give all the gamblers and speculators, and all the ravenous beasts of prey that consume the substance of the industrious and the poor, a harvest of spoil and a carnival of indulgence; but there will be plenty of money in the land at last, and the South will "get even" with the North for the war. The finances of the United States will be equalized with those of the Southern Confederacy. Confederate bonds and National bonds will belong in a common abyss. The era of the perfect equality of citizens and sections will come—when we are all fallen into the bottomless pit of bankruptcy together.

Would Governor Tilden, as President of the United States, consent to such a catastrophe? I am not here to speak of the personal character of Governor Tilden. I suppose he is as well known in New York as Governor

Hayes in Ohio, and I leave him to you. Grant him all the good qualities his friends believe him to possess, and he could not be the master of the Democratic party. There is a stupendous Devil in that party that will not be mastered. As to civil service reform, a Democratic President could not resist the demand to turn everybody out, to make room for as many of his party as possible; and it is unreasonable to hold that the public business could be seriously thought of. Why, if there was to be a Democratic President inaugurated, the crowd of office-seekers around the Public Buildings in Washington would be like that of the sight-seers at the Centennial on Pennsylvania's day. Fancy an old gentleman like Governor Tilden, not feeble, perhaps, but certainly not robust, resisting the mad onset of this hungry multitude, in the name of civil service reform! The attrition would be too great for any human endurance.

It is remarkable in our annals that there has more than once been a dramatic removal of a President who stood in the way of the pronounced policy of the most advanced thinkers of the party of the Solid South. General Harrison, having John Tyler behind him, was speedily taken hence. General Taylor, after the development of his opposition to the Cotton States Conspirators, was suddenly called away. James Buchanan was poisoned with the rats at the National Hotel, but through strength of constitution was spared to see that the Nation had no right to preserve itself—and his health was good, while the country was ready to perish. If Governor Tilden should enter into an unseemly antagonism with the more active and potent influences of his party, I apprehend that his strength would soon be shaken and fretted away in the severe friction of his position, and might fail him altogether; that he would be as unable to withstand, through a Presidential term, the racket of the contending patriots as Harrison was—or that he might find a midsummer's cherry-pie lunch as fatal as Taylor found it. Even if Governor Tilden means real reform, we know that his party does not; and so great an interest should not hang by the thread of one life. And it

Tilden were not, where in the world could his party find a Reformer? The people of New York are not, I think, enamored of the "wise finance" of the Governor of Indiana, where the doctrine is taught that the leaves of the sycamore, with the United States stamp upon them, are "real money."

Governor Seymour recommends the people to elect a Democratic President, by way of keeping up a division of responsibility in the departments of the Government. I fear, if the experiment were tried, that the result would not approve his judgment. It is hard to separate Senates from Executive Power. The Senate of the United States would be moved, as by the attraction of gravitation, to harmony with the White House.

Then the Supreme Court is not the invulnerable barrier against Executive usurpation and sectional aggression that it stands for in the popular estimation. A very respectable minority of the Judges are Democratic. Others are approaching the time of life when not only retirement is thought of, but provision is made for it. The extent of the country, and the accumulation of business suggest reorganization, and an increase in the number of the Judges.

A Democratic President and House would have the Senate and the Supreme Court also, within two years, if not earlier. And who can believe that in this case—with the united and determined Confederate South as the bottom fact and the impelling force of the party in power—the amendments to the Constitution could stand? The equality asserted by the politicians of the South—the equality of the Rebellion with the Authorities—the equal rights in their Fathers' House of the Confederate with the National soldiers—the equal rights of the States that seceded with those that adhered—the personal susceptibilities of the Southern leaders—the policy of the Feast of the Fatted Calf—do not mean anything less than that the war amendments shall be wiped from the Constitution. It is not "the Constitution as it is," that commands the veneration of the Democratic party. It is the old Constitution—the Constitution as it was, over which they asserted an exclusive right

of interpretation, that they revere and would restore—and that they would again construe in their own, old way. Then we would all be "loyal," except those who smote sovereign States to the dust, and they declared the murderers of States and the minions of despotism, might at last be forgiven by the exalted Confederates. They could only be forgiven, however, on the ground that their errors were involuntary—that their trespasses upon sacred soil must be charitably charged to youthful enthusiasm and helpless ignorance of the Constitution. And we should all be called to remember that the great and only exponents of that instrument dwell in the South, entitled to the dignity of a dynasty in the rare enjoyment of Restoration to their dominions. There is no capacity within the Democratic party to resist the programme of the Solid South, for, as they concede its justice, the assertion of its inexpediency must be in vain.

The change that the people desire is a change for the better—a reformation, not a revolution—and the economy called for could hardly be found in doubling the National debt. I believe we could count upon a wholesome change—upon an economical, honorable, high-minded administration, if Governor Hayes were elected President; and I feel it may be worth while, under the circumstances, to speak of my personal knowledge of the man. I have been acquainted with him about a quarter of a century, and he improves upon acquaintance. He and I lived in the same ward for several years, and belonged to the Cincinnati Literary Club—the only society of which, outside of college and army associations, he ever was a member.

The story that he was a Know-Nothing, repeated in various forms, does not resemble the truth in any shape it has taken.

I was in consultation with him in March, 1856, in organizing a People's Movement, the primary object of which was to defeat the Know-Nothing party in Cincinnati. We met in the office of Stephen Molitor, the leader of the Liberal Germans at that time; and, though it is more than twenty years ago, I remember the apt remark of Hayes, as

some of those enlisted with us were willing themselves to be candidates, that the people would probably be more impressed with the fitness for office of a man if he was not himself active in making the ticket. He was to have been called to preside at the meeting that we appointed to present the cause of Reform to the people, but the Know-Nothings took possession of the hall by a concerted movement of delegations from their Lodges; and they had only this measure of success to console themselves withal, for they were defeated in the election of the April following, and their prestige in Cincinnati was broken.

When Colonel Hayes came home after the battle of South Mountain, badly wounded, with his shattered arm in a sling, he was asked to attend a public meeting to aid in getting his ward "out of the draft." He at first declined to go, but as his old neighbors insisted, he consented, and was called upon for a speech. His opening remark was that it had been his preference, glad as he was to see those about him, not to be present on that occasion, for he was not certain that he sympathized with the object for which they assembled. The first duty of the people was to fill up the wasted ranks of the army. If the object of the meeting was to send to the field the number of men that the order for the draft called for in the ward, he was heartily with them; but if it was the policy to clear the ward on paper, without reference to the number of recruits furnished, he did not desire that they should succeed.

It was immediately ascertained that the object of the meeting was not at all that the able-bodied men of the ward should escape the draft, but to send the material for good soldiers to the front! It would not have been suspected by any one looking in upon the meeting, that the wounded officer in weather-beaten blue clothes—a common soldier's blouse, with a war-worn eagle on the shoulder;—the officer with a blue eye that kindled as he spoke, and a voice with the ring of martial music in it—was a man likely to be accused of lacking a will and ways of his own.

Many earnest people have for some years made a close study of civil service reform, and the theory is generally

accepted that this sort of reform, at least, is desirable. The language of Governor Hayes, in accepting the Cincinnati nomination, is on this subject singularly explicit, and those who had given the methods of the reform their closest attention, were struck with the fact that Hayes wrote about it as if he had been thinking of it for himself. And so he had. He commenced the work of civil service reform in his first term as Governor of Ohio.

Understanding experimentally the question, the words of his letter of acceptance sped to the center of the mark like rifle-balls, showing the "white disc" at every shot. One of his well-taken points, after his first election, in 1868, was that minorities should have representation in elective boards. In 1870, he urged upon the Legislature the passage of a law incorporating this "measure of reform," and the law was secured and is retained, proving highly useful. He carried the principle of minority representation into his appointments of public boards and officers, and did it to an extent that made enemies in his own party. He has pursued the same policy in his third gubernatorial term, reappointing nine Democrats, appointees of Governor Allen, to salaried positions in the penal and benevolent institutions of the State. In making out the Supreme Court Commission, he appointed three Democrats, and when the Republican Legislature created a Police Board in Cincinnati, the Governor appointed a Democrat on the Board; and he has had a clever faculty in finding a few places for Liberal Republicans, who are not now, I understand, in possession of a party of their own! Those who have known Governor Hayes longest, and have had the closest opportunities for observation, are the most positive of his friends, in the judgment that if he is elected President, he will have a very large influence in the administration.

There is already an outcry from the South that those who are unwilling to concede that the war was fought in vain, are narrow and bitter; and they are supposed to have inherited the sectional opprobrium once attached, in the conceit of the Confederates, to the opponents of the extension of slavery—yet there has been nothing since Lincoln

at Gettysburg, in better temper, or with finer insight, or in happier phrase, than the passage relating to the South in the letter of Governor Hayes accepting the Cincinnati nomination. His sense of justice and sentiment of generosity—a brave man's respect for the brave, a strong man's sympathy with misfortune,—shine through the clear sentences; and taking him all in all, I feel warranted in hopefulness that if he becomes our Chief Magistrate, we may find in him the gift of statesmanship for the healing of the Nation.

Citizens of the State of New York: The lesson of the war that never should depart from us is, that the American people have no exemption from the ordinary fate of humanity. If we sin, we must suffer for our sins, like the Empires that are tottering and the Nations that have perished. Sixteen years ago we were drifting into war, and, though the current was like the Niagara rapids, few among us felt that it was irresistible, and saw the shores of the land of peace and plenty recede, or heard the swelling roar of the cataract. Whither are we drifting in these Indian summer days? Upon what portentous stream is the Ship of State? Is it sailing

> "Through channels measureless by man,
> Down to a sunless sea?"

There is in the prescribed form of counting the Electoral votes cast, or certified to be cast, for President, an uncertainty that, in the state of the country, may be fitly described as a peril. The houses of Congress are already at variance. They quarreled on this subject when the Republicans had a majority in both, and the vote of the disputed State made no difference in the general result. The joint rules, including the twenty-second, have been abolished, and there is only the Constitutional provision as a guide. In a contingency that is not only not impossible, but not improbable, there is certain to be a disagreement involving a disputed Presidential election, which would be a calamity without precedent and beyond calculation. Thoughtful citizens long ago, feeling this possibility as a palpable though distant terror, have prayed that the Presidential elections might always be decisive—and God grant that

they may. But we are pressing closely upon the danger in the dark. The October elections have not, as in other days, settled the question of the Presidency. What if the November election also should be inconclusive? What if the result of the question of Tilden or Hayes for President rested upon a Southern State—upon Mississippi or South Carolina, with the Derringer in one and the Bayonet in the other; and the heated politicians, gathered at Washington, and desperate, should fly at each other's throats, and let slip the dogs of war? A disputed Presidential election would Mexicanize us. There is incalculable ruin in it. If the New York electoral vote is given the Democratic candidates, we are imminently threatened with this degradation. If New York is Republican, the danger is over.

The whole duty of the Republicans of the State will be performed, for they know their responsibility, and value their privilege. It would appear also that the good citizens who do not "give up to party what was meant for mankind," see that the safety of the country demands the defeat of the Democratic party, and will be happy to administer to it the final stroke of fate, and thus open with auspicious fortune the Second Century of the Republic.

THE ONLY POINT IN TILDEN'S LETTER WHICH REQUIRES ANALYSIS REVIEWED—THE SUPREME COURT AND THE CLAIMS—THE DEMOCRATIC WAY TO MAKE TIMES GOOD AND MONEY PLENTY.

To the Editor of the World:

In the leading article of this morning's issue of your journal I am called upon as an "expert" in Southern claims, and asked what I have to say in reply to your remarks on my Cooper Union address. I venture to assume that you want to hear from me, and avail myself with much pleasure of the opportunity that your call affords, to notice certain lines of commentary upon that address, that have a tendency to misdirect the attention of the public. The feeling that I experience of obligation to you for this call is akin to the sense of grateful appreciation that I enjoyed

of the timeliness of Governor Tilden's letter, in which, on the morning of my deliverance on Southern claims, he kindly testified that the subject to which I was about addressing myself was the business and burning question of the day.

I do not claim to be an "expert" in Southern claims, but my attention has been for some time directed to them, and I have been deeply impressed by their magnitude and by the threatening force that is behind them, while I have been surprised by the lack of general understanding of the extent and imminence of the danger that appears in the levity or indifference with which the matter has until now been treated in this part of the country. Governor Tilden is not a man who lacks capacity in affairs, and his letter of the 24th shows that while his courage may be shaken he has not lost the clearness of his faculty of apprehension or the cunning of his right hand. In the contingency of Democratic success, if there is anything in the performance of the promises that letter contains, that proves his announcement of the "futility" of the "self-imposed restraints" of candidates to have been an error in his case—if there happens to be anything within his capacity that hinders the Solid South in its movement to "get even" in money with the North for the war—I promise to take the sincerest satisfaction in recognizing it, and to give him all the help I can command; for I am sure in that case he will stand in great need of friends not of his party.

There are half a dozen lines only in Governor Tilden's letter that seem to require analysis. The quotations from the Constitution and his message are irrelevant, but he says:

"No claim for any loss or damage incurred *by disloyal* persons arising from the late war, whether covered by the Fourteenth Amendment or not, will be recognized or paid. The cotton tax will not be refunded. I shall deem it my duty to veto every bill providing for the assumption or payment of *any such debts, losses, damages*, claims, or for the refunding of any such tax."

Governor Tilden has neglected to notice that the advo-

cacy of the war claims in the South is based upon the theory that "we are all loyal now;" and he has only to accept this favorite Southern doctrine of the day, and the declaration by Mr. Cabell, of Virginia, in his report from the Committee on War Claims, that the loyalty that results from official pardon is retroactive, to justify himself in not vetoing any of the acts of legislation that he specifies.

I quoted, in the Cooper Union address, the report, on the 30th of June, 1876, from the House Committee on War Claims that accompanied the bill for the relief of Pickrell and Broocks. Mr. Cabell said in it that when a claimant had a special pardon, and was within the provisions of the several proclamations and general pardon of amnesties, the proof of such pardon was "equivalent to affirmative proof under the statute of captured and abandoned property, that the party never gave aid and comfort to the rebellion." Therefore, any claim preferred by a pardoned rebel would be a loyalist's claim under the law, and Governor Tilden's promise to veto the claims of disloyal persons would not have effect in their cases; and there are very few rebels now of any other sort.

Mr. Cabell also stated that the United States Government stood, for "property taken," in the position of trustee for the owners. The World quotes a decision of Chief Justice Waite, and contends that he holds precisely the doctrine announced by Mr. Cabell. If this were so, it would justly increase the public disquietude about Southern claims, for it would appear that the highest judicial tribunal in the country had opened wide the gate for the Confederate advance upon the Treasury; and this would be quick and thorough corroboration of my guarded expressions of a fear that the Supreme Court was not to be relied upon as an invulnerable barrier. I thought the process of reorganization would be required before the Court could reach the point that, according to the World, it has already passed.

With respectful deference, however, to the legal talent of the World, I submit that Waite's decision that the Government stands in the position of trustee for persons who,

under a special act of Congress, were entitled to the proceeds of captured and abandoned property, "and for those whom it (the government) should thereafter recognize as entitled"—words the world is at pains to print in italics—is far from being as comprehensive as Mr. Cabell's report that the Government was the trustee for the owners of all "property taken" for the use of the army, and that a rebel with Andrew Johnson's pardon was in possession of "affirmative proof" that he "never gave aid and comfort to the rebellion." I do not care to waste a word in discussing with anybody the political character of the Supreme Court. I am only concerned to show the people that if they place the Democratic party in power, there are no sufficient restraints to prevent the "Solid South" from making a raid on the Treasury of the United States; and I thank the World for the assistance it has unwittingly given in making conspicuous this important fact, and throwing under a strong light Mr. Cabell's very significant report.

Reference is made to the "contrivances of Congress," in 1863, touching "captured and abandoned property," but I am not in the least degree anxious to show that when the Republicans were in power in Congress they made a perfect record. I am aware of the misconduct of Republicans in and out of Congress, and have spent a good deal of time and labor in attempting to persuade them of the errors of their ways. The "contrivances" that are of interest at this time are those of the Confederates to obtain out of the people at large compensation for their losses during the war.

In 1872 (April 13), Mr. Ritchie, of Maryland, denounced the act of July 4, 1864, that restricted payments for "property taken" to loyal claimants, because there were strict requirements that proof should be had not only of actual taking, but of loyalty; and because provision was not made to pay for property damaged and destroyed. Mr. Wilshire, of Arkansas, in House Resolution (last session) No. 553, desires to "facilitate the adjustment and settlement" of claims, and proposes the abolishment of the Claims Commission, and that the jury of the vicinage shall be called

to levy damages. Mr. Riddle, of Tennessee, has introduced a bill directing "compensation for the use and occupation" of property "to all citizens;" and to facilitate getting at the public money, one witness is declared enough to "effectually establish the fact" of the appropriation of property. These are among the contrivances to turn over the property of the people of the United States to Southern rebels, as "indemnity" for the "aggressive war" made upon them by the Nation.

Mr. Riddle, of the Fourth Tennessee District, the author of the bill to expedite the payment of the claims of Confederates, has been made so popular by his urgency in their behalf that his competitor has withdrawn from the canvass, and the legislation that Mr. Riddle proposes is regarded as the way to "make times good and money plenty." Now, Mr. Riddle and Governor Tilden would not be troubled to reach an understanding and co-operate in the interests of "reform and economy." Mr. Riddle would not pay the claims of disloyalists. He, too, would veto such things. He stands upon a broad principle. He discounts Mr. Cabell's report that a pardoned rebel has affirmative proof that he was always loyal. He says, "all Southern people are loyal now," and always were so in the eye of the law. Can a decision by Chief Justice Waite be found covering this ground also? Accept it, and Tilden's promises pass away, and the Solid South comes to the front for its indemnity.

You tell us: "The great majority of the South does not seek any payment of Southern claims." You are mistaken. There are tens of thousands of war claims carefully prepared in the South awaiting, with the Wilshire resolution and the Riddle bill, to accept, according to Mr. Cabell, from their "trustee" pecuniary redress for all grievances. Douglass Jerrold said of the soil of Australia, that if you tickled it with a hoe it would laugh with a harvest. It is the peculiarity of the Southern soil that wherever it was tickled by a United States bayonet there is an eruption of Confederate claims; and the Solid South, if the Democratic party obtains possession of the Government, will speed-

ily disentangle the "futile" technicalities of Governor Tilden's letter, interposed in the newspapers between them and the Treasury when the South was utterly committed to him, and the Presidential election was plainly to be decided by New York.

You speak of the already heavy taxation of the South, and that the people of that section would not tax themselves to pay their own claims. The plea of the South is poverty. But the plan is to establish equality in money matters with the North. Three-fourths of the revenue out of which the claims would be paid must come from the States that adhered to the Union in the war.

And do you forget that a vast majority of the Western Democrats are fully persuaded that the way to make the people happy and wealthy, to make "times good and money plenty," is to print "more greenbacks?" They desire to "make the amount of currency equal to the wants of trade." They would have war times in Wall street in time of peace. Governor Tilden yielded the point that the date fixed for resumption should be repealed; and some knowledge of Western Democrats leads me to believe that if he keeps their favor, he has but taken the first step in a long walk of concessions on the currency question, in which he will have to unlearn the teachings of his forty years of public discussion of that range of subjects.

In the event of a Democratic Administration, the Solid South and the Solid Mississippi Valley would be united on the basis of more greenbacks to pay Southern Claims and carry out the rebel and inflation programme: and the fact that the inevitable end must be general repudiation, would not deter, but rather inspire them; for in the abyss of bankruptcy there would be the equalization of the finances of the Southern Confederacy with the United States. I doubt whether Governor Tilden's bosom would fortify the country like a wall of adamant against the allied powers of the Solid South as a claimant, and the rag-baby as the master of the mysteries of wise finance.

M. Halstead.

New York, Friday, October 27, 1876.

THE WORTHLESSNESS OF GOV. TILDEN'S RECENT PLEDGE—DEMANDS BEYOND MR. TILDEN'S CONTROL—A SINGLE SAMPLE IN MISSOURI OF WHAT THE SOUTH ARE DETERMINED TO HAVE WITH DEMOCRATIC VICTORY—TILDEN'S DEFEAT THE ONLY SAFEGUARD.

To the Editor of the World:

In a spirit of reciprocity for your "memorandum" of this morning, I desire to place at your service a few items that will be found of interest to the tax-payers who have had their attention called, by Gov. Tilden's letter and other documents, to the Southern raid upon the National Treasury with Confederate war claims.

I was glad to see Gov. Tilden's letter, and the disclaimers from Southern men of a purpose to press those claims are all welcome: for those who have studied the question with the greatest attention have the gravest apprehension of its magnitude. Gov. Tilden's letter is proof of the existence of the "public peril" that I attempted to describe in the address that was sufficiently "delivered" to serve my purposes in preparing it. He certainly did go further than his partisan friends have been accustomed to do, in admitting that there might be Southern claims not covered by the fourteenth amendment. If I have not heretofore done justice to that admission, I propose now to do work meet for repentance of the sin of omission.

You quote Gov. Tilden as saying:

"No claim for any loss or damage incurred by disloyal persons arising from the late war, *whether covered by the fourteenth amendment or not*, will be recognized or paid."

The amount of this is that Gov. Tilden offers us his personal pledge as security against the payment of the claims outside the fourteenth amendment. Without questioning his sincerity—as might be done under the circumstances without extraordinary bitterness of antagonism—I must pronounce the security insufficient. It is well to have it, but it is poor collateral to put up with the amendment. Indeed, I am of opinion that if the Democratic Party takes

possession of the Government, neither the Constitution nor the President could stand against the solid South and resist the war claims of that section for two years. The fourteenth amendment is not the child of the Democratic Party, and the Democratic President who could withstand the master of his party—the solid South—as a claimant for damages during the war by trespasses on the sacred soil, has not been invented and certainly has not appeared in Gov. Tilden.

The passage from Governor Tilden's letter is given above as the *World* italicized it. I desire to emphasize the words "disloyal persons." The theory upon which the solid South presses its claims is that there are no such persons. Mr. Cabell, of Virginia, reports from the Committee on War Claims, in a bill granting relief in a tobacco case, that, legally, a pardoned rebel never was a rebel at all. That, I suppose, must be the Democratic law. Mr. Riddle, of Tennessee, says, "we are all loyal now," a phrase that covers the Democratic sentiment. Why, then, does Governor Tilden use the expression "disloyal persons" in a letter calling for legal exactness as well as a strictly defined expression of the feeling and judgment of his party?

If there are any persons not according to law loyal under the interpretation that Mr. Cahill makes of pardons, it is the Democratic policy that their loyalty shall be recognized and established. This would leave Mr. Tilden's pledge without application, with the exception of the part alloted to "scrutiny," which is to be done with "jealous care"—words which are not of much value within a fortnight of a Presidential election.

I do not believe Gov. Tilden and his lieutenants in labor in this city have understood the full extent of the solicitude there is in the solid South about war claims, or the dangerous aspirations that have been enkindled with the hopes of Democratic victory; and the demand that I understand to have been made from the Tilden head-quarters for assurances by telegraph from the party leaders in the Southern States that they are not expecting, with the advent of the Democratic party to power, to secure payment

for loss or damage suffered by them during the late war, is as cruel as it is "futile."

I did not notice that Missouri has been heard from in this connection. She has taken action to press, with the sovereign force inherent in a State, the claims of her citizens. Gov. Woodson, in his annual Message to the General Assembly, Jan. 6, 1875, says:

"There were presented to the Board of Commissioners 11,961 claims, amounting in the aggregate to $4,844,362.29. Seven thousand five hundred and fifty-four of those claims were allowed during the time in which the board had the right to sit, and certificates have been issued therefor aggregating the sum of $2,382,132.67. At the expiration of the time fixed by law for the adjustment of the claims pending before them, there were a great many claims unacted upon, *it proving a physical impossibility for the Commissioners to examine and pass upon all the claims filed within the time prescribed by the act.*"

One of the certificates issued has been negotiated, and has fallen into the hands of the Republican National Executive Committee. It is hereby marked for identification, and filed as evidence:

No. 52. $55 80.

It is hereby certified that the State of Missouri is indebted to Woodford M. Paris in the sum of fifty-five and 80-100 dollars on account of supplies furnished. This certificate is not payable by the State until after the claim of said Woodford M. Paris has been presented *to the United States Government, and the amount allowed and paid to the State, and then only for the actual amount received from the United States Government.*

City of Jefferson, Mo., Sept. 8, 1874.

Silas Woodson, Governor of Missouri.

J. V. Crafton, Acting Quartermaster General.

The printed indorsement on the certificate is: "Issued in accordance with the provisions of an act of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, approved March 19, 1874."

Please to notice Gov. Woodson's pathetic statement that it was physically impossible to examine all the claims presented, and, therefore, as the time in which the commission had a right to sit was unfortunately limited, only 7,554 of them could be "scrutinized with jealous care," as it were, and passed upon, that certificates might be issued. So the first crop of these claims in one State, before a commission restricted to a few months' work, and embarrassed by the necessity of assuming to pay some regard to the loyalty of the claimants, amounted to more than seven thousand five hundred certificates to be paid through the State Treasury when "presented to the United States Government and the amount allowed." This does not seem to be a small matter.

Now, if the Statute of Limitations is repealed; if the Supreme Court of the United States has defined the Trusteeship of the Government, as the World says it has; and if it has also declared, as I understand the World to say, that the issue of a special pardon to a rebel proves innocence and not guilt—proves not that the pardoned person was a disloyalist, but that he always was loyal—it must be admitted that there is a very broad road leading into the Treasury of the United States from the South. If we add Mr. Wilshire's scheme to "facilitate" claims by authorizing suits to be instituted in the United States Courts, and have a trial "by juries of the vicinage," and if we accept also Mr. Riddle's resolution that the testimony of "any reputable citizen" shall be sufficient to "effectually establish" a claim, we have certainly facilitated the work of "adjusting" the money out of the Treasury in a remarkable degree, without calling upon Gov. Tilden to veto the Riddle bill or to perform any other act equally distressing to his Southern supporters.

It is said that when Gov. Tilden's friends gathered around him and congratulated him upon his nomination at St. Louis, he said: "The people want reform—that's me;" or words to that effect. This may not be authentic, but it resembles the theory of the letter of last week, admitting the existence of a danger, but answering for the candidate him-

self: "Here am I. The country is safe with me. I will veto."

Too much depends here upon the one-man power. Even if we might trust Gov. Tilden as far as he goes, we can not afford to trust his party. It is the character of the party and not the will of the man that is important. I thought it pertinent, in a former letter, to refer to Gov. Tilden's contempt, no longer ago than August last, for the self-imposed restraints upon candidates. He saw their futility then, though he asserts their sufficiency now. The people are likely to accept Gov. Tilden's cooler judgment as to the futility of such restraints; at any rate so far as he is himself concerned, and to restrain him from a position in which he at least could not prevent infinite mischief. The best and only complete security against Confederate war claims, is to put it out of the power of the Confederates, in the capacity of United States authorities for another term of four years, to pass upon them and pay them out of the National Treasury, or to bankrupt the country by war issues in time of peace, of legal-tender paper to pay the claims in question and make money plenty. Mr. Riddle was telling the people of the Fourth Tennessee District, until he was visited by a phonographer, that Democratic victory meant the payment of the Southern war claims, and then there would be plenty of money and good times. Perhaps the people of New York are not prepared to approve that programme. If they are not, they have but one safe course, and that is to stop the Southern raid upon the Treasury where it is, by defeating the Democratic Party.

As to the sense of safety that the country should feel under the promises of personal protection that Governor Tilden has given, I quote from his Kent letter, dated Oct. 26, 1860, the following passage, which I think may be pronounced pertinent and instructive:

"What will Mr. Lincoln do? Can he be expected, as President, to understand the state of things in any other sense than that of his own partizan policy? Can he avoid the attempt to maintain the power of his party by the same means which will have acquired it? Can he emancipate

himself from the dominion of the ideas, associations, and influences which will have accompanied him in his rise to power? Can he be expected to act in any new direction with sufficient breadth of view and firmness of purpose?"

The question, "What will Mr. Tilden do?" is not to be disregarded; but it is not the question of the day, and we should not permit it to become so. His veto might save the country, but we would prefer leaning upon a more certain support. In his Kent letter he said, after showing the peril of relying upon the possible policy of one man, "I can not, for one, assent to the creation of such a state of things." We can not do better than to apply this doctrine to the case before us; and I say of him, as he said of Lincoln, in concluding the letter from which we have been quoting, "defeat him and all our great interests and hopes are unquestionably safe." M. HALSTEAD.

NEW YORK, October 29, 1876.

THE

WAR CLAIMS OF THE SOUTH.

THE NEW SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY, WITH THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AS ITS CLAIM AGENCY, DEMANDING INDEMNITY FOR CONQUEST, AND THREATENING A DISPUTED PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

THE CANDIDACY OF HAYES AND THE RELIEF OF THE REPUBLIC FROM DANGER.

AN ADDRESS

At Cooper Institute, New York, Wednesday Evening, October 25, 1876,

AND LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK WORLD REPLYING TO THAT JOURNAL, AND TO GOVERNOR TILDEN,

By M. HALSTEAD,
OF CINCINNATI.

CINCINNATI:
ROBERT CLARKE & CO., PRINTERS.
1876.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 789 583 3